United Nations

A/C.1/56/6

General Assembly

Distr.: General
2 November 2001
English
Original: Arabic

Fifty-sixth session
First Committee
Agenda item 74
General and complete disarmament

Letter dated 1 November 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a letter from Mr. Saddam Hussein, President of the Republic of Iraq, to the peoples and Governments of the West, including the United States of America.

I should be grateful if you would have this letter and its annex circulated as a document of the First Committee under agenda item 74 entitled "General and complete disarmament".

(*Signed*) Mohammed A. **Aldouri**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

01-61934 (E) 061101 061101

Annex to the letter dated 1 November 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

President Saddam Hussein addresses a third open letter to the peoples and Governments of the West

President Saddam Hussein has addressed a third open letter to the peoples and Governments of the West, including the United States of America. The text of the letter reads as follows:

In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate

Once again we address a letter to all the peoples and Governments of the West, including the United States of America.

Peace be upon those who expect a greeting of peace from us or who say, when such a greeting is addressed to them: "And peace be upon you".

The entire world focused its attention on following and analysing the events of last September. While those who concerned themselves with an in-depth analysis may not have been the majority, it seems to us that their number has now increased, as has the number of Government officials who are taking a deeper look at the background and causes of those events as well as the consequences. At the time when the events occurred, however, both their number and the level of their response were distressing to anyone who did not realize that not everyone is capable of a deeper insight into major events or complex circumstances, just as not many are capable of dreaming of something better.

Now that the emotional reaction to the events has somewhat subsided in the hearts and minds of both those who were elated and those who were distressed, I think that the role of leaders, backed by their peoples, must be based on a description of responsibility and the role of leaders. The most important attribute of a leader and of leadership is saving people from danger, not merely by signalling dark pits along the road, but also by preventing those who do not see the signs from falling into an abyss. After that comes the attribute of advancement, of elevating the condition of those for whom the leader is responsible and the capacity to think and to act that they possess and have stored, so that they reach a higher level. Any danger that confronts a people or a nation requires of those responsible not merely a leadership role against the peril, but also a study of its causes with a view to their mitigation or radical treatment, so as to eliminate them altogether or render them unable to spring back up.

Unfortunately, the general trend in that direction is still weak, and Western Governments exhibit the most outstanding inability when it comes to finding the right approach. Indeed, some voices have arisen among the people, to some extent among journalists and writers and, in a very limited way, among the ranks of those who are preparing themselves in the background to replace those in power there. The latter voices, however, are still hesitant and deal with the situation according to what they see as advantageous with regard to the posts they seek to occupy and the influence of the related centres of power. As far as the United States is concerned, until now the hope that its people might become aware, if confronted with the naked facts, is greater than one might expect from its administration, except if such

administrations become liberated from the overriding ascendancy of zionism and other centres of influence that act in their own interest in accordance with their own well-known objectives.

The events of 11 September and the angry or opportunistic reactions that followed them, including the brutal aggression against Afghanistan based on a suspicion and the accompanying innuendos and statements emanating from the media or from officials, both American and non-American, have shown that the entire world could be set ablaze by a spark from the West, even one coming from beyond the Atlantic. Starting a fire, however, is naturally easier than extinguishing it. And because good deeds are uplifting, while evil deeds cause the soul to sink to lower levels, doing evil is easier for those who are so inclined.

On the basis of this realistic picture, the entire world needs to save itself from a bottomless chasm towards which it might be pushed by the United States of America and others like it, be they States, individuals or organizations. In fact, the United States, given what we know about how its leaders behave in crises, needs to be saved by the world as the world saves itself rather than being pulled down by the weight of the United States as it falls into a fathomless pit from which there is no emerging until it fills up with blood and tragic casualties, if it does not drown those who cannot swim.

As we have said before to those who committed aggression against us in 1991 and thereafter, including the United States, both during and before the glorious "mother of battles", the world, like Iraq and its Arab nation, needs to have the Iraqi people remain steadfast in the face of aggression, foil aggressive efforts and not allow the United States to triumph, because a victory of the United States and its allies over Iraq, God forbid, would eliminate the opposition and the other view in the international and regional arena and not allow it to re-emerge for a long time. And when tyranny and oppression are encouraged ... Indeed, the United States is not in need of any further conceit or arrogance: had it triumphed over Iraq at the time, God forbid, its additional conceit would have driven it to yet greater conceit, moving it and, with it, the world even closer to the abyss, rather than further from it.

Yes, distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen, conceit and arrogance need someone to confront them and oppression needs someone to confront it, just as making light of committing evil deeds and throwing anthrax at people need someone to confront them. In line with what we have said regarding Iraq, which confronts those who commit aggression against it, the world now needs to thwart the hostile schemes of the United States, including its brutal aggression against the people of Afghanistan. That aggression must be stopped.

Once again we say that whenever someone feels that he is wronged, and no one fends off from him the injustice or puts an end to it, he will seek by himself a way to throw off the injustice. Clearly, not everyone is able to find the best way to rid himself of the injustice; people turn to whatever they think is best based on their own efforts and their own reasoning. Not everyone is able to exert himself beyond what is immediately at hand, in order to arrive at the optimum idea or means.

In order for one who suffers injustice to find the best way, after finding his way to God and discovering his rights and the rights of others with respect to him, he must not be isolated from the natural environment of which he is a part, nor must he be ignored, either deliberately or through underestimation, by the persons

responsible for that environment; rather, they should make him feel secure and help him to save himself and his environment.

It is natural to say that punishment commensurate with evil action is necessary in this worldly life, for whatever is necessary in the next life contains a sign pointing to its necessity in this life as well. However, punishment in the next life is just, and the prophets, may peace be upon them all, when warning of punishment in the next life or punishment in this world, did so in accordance with God's command that there be justice, not on the basis of a suspicion or whim. Any punishment meted out by humans, if it is to be convincing, must be fair and serve the purpose of justice. I think that you, distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen, or at least those who govern you, often criticize those whom you decide to criticize in order to weaken them among the States of the world, outside the West, for operating on the basis of emergency laws, for such laws, as you see it, cannot correct a general principle. Yet now, in contradiction to the remarks we have grown accustomed to hearing against those whom you accuse of dictatorship and authoritarian rule, we are seeing dozens of emergency measures and laws being adopted by the Governments of Western States, first and foremost the United States, as a result of a single painful event that has befallen them.

Do you realize, distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen, how many painful events have befallen the countries and peoples you have been accusing of being undemocratic? And are you aware that what has befallen them is more momentous and more serious than the events that occurred in the United States on 11 September?! This in itself ought, for example, to be a matter of concern to both the Governments and peoples of the West, though it is not our main subject here.

Once again, we say that injustice, and the resulting pressure on people, lead to explosions and that, as explosions are not orderly everyday events, they can be expected to harm those who cause them, and other people as well, and their impact maybe greater than was intended. It is in this light, and in the light of the unbalanced reactions on the part of supposedly democratic Governments, that the events of 11 September should be seen, if the Americans, and the world, are certain that the perpetrators came from abroad.

But let us focus not on these important matters but rather on what is the most important of all: we say again, now it is clear that any fire can spread over the entire world, that justice must, first and foremost, be based on equity and that force should be used not for its own sake or opportunistically but rather in order to achieve the best outcome. The highest expression of this lies in the example of what Almighty God has ordained. Even if we fundamentally disagree on our understanding of this, we should not prevent others from having access to and enjoying what we want for ourselves, and we should not adopt double standards towards others by giving them what we do not want and what we reject for ourselves. We must understand that no one who has a fortune can be secure or keep it safely in a society of starving people. A wealthy man will be in worse trouble if he has made his fortune at the expense of the hungry, by exploiting them. The Second Caliph in the state of Islam, Umar ibn al-Khattab (may God be pleased with him) ordered that the punishment of a thief by cutting off his hand in the year of Ramada should be set aside despite the fact that the sentence was clearly prescribed in the Koran. He did so because his sense as a true believer told him that the correct standards of the faith may be inadequate when a man and his family are starving, and because he regarded hunger as something

more heinous than theft, and considered that saving someone from ruin was more important than protecting a person's property. He suspended a provision of Islamic law. Do the people of our own time follow that precept so as to live in peace and security? Or do those concerned imagine that the security they seek for themselves will be achieved by stepping up the killing, intimidation and starvation of others?

We have heard in the news recently that American officials think that the source of the anthrax is the United States itself. We do not know whether this conclusion, or item of information, is merely a tactic to divert attention from the statement, which terrified some people, that the source of the disease was bin Laden, an accusation which, together with other accusations that have been made, led many Americans to say that they should not persist in harming the people he cares for because that might provoke them to react more strongly, or whether the person who put out the information, took the view — in order to divert the attention of public opinion in the United States from the inadequacy of American officialdom following the events of 11 September — that the purpose had been achieved and that the deed should be buried and the perpetrators forgotten about.

In any case, this and other things show that weapons of mass destruction become a burden to those who possess them, and to mankind, if they are not absolutely necessary for self-defence and for national defence. For that reason, instead of busying themselves and the world with the so-called anti-missile defence system, exhausting their coffers and those of others, emptying the pockets of American taxpayers and involving themselves and others in hostility against one people or another, Americans should first of all set about eliminating the weapons of mass destruction in the United States itself, and at the same time, or later, doing so in the rest of the world. It goes without saying that the West, including the United States, was the first to create weapons of mass destruction, in other words nuclear, biological and chemical weapons, and it was the West, led by the United States, that was the first to use such weapons. The events of September, and statements by the Americans themselves to the effect that the anthrax had its source in the United States, clearly indicate the importance of world cooperation, based on a binding treaty, to eliminate the burden and threat of weapons of mass destruction as a first step that might encourage the taking of other steps if injustice and aggression are to diminish. The primary danger to mankind and to the people of the United States of America is American weapons of mass destruction and similar weapons belonging to the Zionist entity and ultimately those of other States.

As the United States is on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean, it is the first country to be asked to take such an initiative in order to confirm its credibility. And as the Zionist entity has seized Arab territory and holy places and oppresses the Arabs and violates their humanity, and as stupid behaviour is to be expected from it, and because the reaction of the oppressed people against the oppressor is also to be expected, it is obviously necessary to divest the Zionist entity of those weapons.

At that stage, when the United States is really willing to divest itself of such weapons, we do not think that any rational person in the world will dissociate himself from such a practical plan.

The NATO aggressors are not likely to oppose the United States, for the United States has less need of such weapons than other States, and it is therefore incumbent on the United States to make a start on its own so that the world may follow its example.

Only then will the United States be dealing even-handedly with the world and pursuing wise policies, and the world will treat it with respect and love when it senses respect and love on the part of the United States. The world, including the United States, will live in peace rather than on the brink of a precipice. Any disagreement that troubles the prevailing calm will be controlled on the basis of genuine solidarity, the solidarity of the brave and the just and not solidarity that is based on intimidation by the powerful or that seeks to gain an advantage or to further certain interests.

I pray to Almighty God that I have conveyed the message, and let God be my witness.

God is great.

God is great.

Saddam **Hussein**

29 October 2001

United Nations A/C.1/56/7

General Assembly

Distr.: General
7 November 2001

Original: English

Fifty-sixth session
First Committee

Letter dated 6 November 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Mexico to the United Nations addressed to the Chairman of the First Committee

I have the honour to request that the present letter and its annex be issued as an official document of the First Committee.

(*Signed*) Jorge Eduardo **Navarrete**

01-62558 (E) 081101

Annex to the letter dated 6 November 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Mexico to the United Nations addressed to the Chairman of the First Committee

Reductions of non-strategic nuclear weapons

New York, 24 October 2001

This paper is supported by Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, South Africa and Sweden, members of the New Agenda Initiative.

We welcome the landmark outcome of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), in particular the unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament. We remain committed to the fulfilment of the practical steps for the systematic and progressive efforts to implement article VI of the Treaty which were agreed at that Conference.

Moreover, at the 2000 NPT Review Conference, there was agreement to the further reduction of non-strategic nuclear weapons, based on unilateral initiatives and as an integral part of the nuclear arms reduction and disarmament process.

The progress achieved in strategic nuclear weapon reductions made unilaterally or bilaterally under the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) process constitutes, in our view, an important step towards nuclear disarmament.

Although we acknowledge that progress has been achieved in non-strategic nuclear weapon reductions based on the unilateral declaration of the United States of America of 27 September 1991, the unilateral declaration of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of 5 October 1991 and the unilateral declaration of the Russian Federation of 29 January 1992, we remain deeply concerned that the total number of nuclear weapons deployed and in stockpile still amounts to many thousands.

We note in the 21 March 1997 Joint Statement on Parameters on Future Reductions in Nuclear Forces by the United States and the Russian Federation in particular that, in the context of START III negotiations, it is expressed that their experts will explore, as separate issues, possible measures relating to tactical nuclear systems, to include appropriate confidence-building and transparency measures.

We believe it is essential to preserve and to build upon the 1991/1992 Presidential Nuclear Initiatives on non-strategic nuclear weapons. In this context, we are convinced that urgent action should be taken to achieve:

- Further reduction of non-strategic nuclear weapons, based on unilateral initiatives and as an integral part of the nuclear arms reduction and disarmament process;
- Further confidence-building and transparency measures to reduce the threats posed by non-strategic nuclear weapons;
- Concrete agreed measures to reduce further the operational status of nuclear weapons systems.

As countries committed to nuclear disarmament, we urge the United States and the Russian Federation to proceed with the reductions of non-strategic nuclear weapons in a transparent and irreversible manner and to include reduction and elimination of non-strategic nuclear weapons in the overall arms reduction negotiations.

Convinced that, in the present situation, the strengthened dialogue and sense of convergence provide a unique opportunity to move forward, we also invite the international community to lend its support and encouragement to this endeavour.